

From: Soscia.MaryLou@epamail.epa.gov
Sent time: 11/21/2006 11:20:43 AM
To: Cope.Ben@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Fw: Dum de dum dum
Attachments: pic25704.gif pic03655.gif pic18065.gif

----- Forwarded by MaryLou Soscia/R10/USEPA/US on 11/21/2006 11:20 AM -----

MaryLou Soscia/R10/USEPA/US

11/20/2006 05:50 PM


To

Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US

cc

Jannine Jennings/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject

Re: Dum de dum dum 

Mike: we need to have a meeting.....(as you said)....Jannine may have told you about our conversations with the Corps (and Denise Keehner) on Thursday about this issue.....many of the topics Ben mentioned were covered to some degree....who is in charge of setting up that meeting?

Mary Lou

▼ Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US

Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US

11/20/2006 05:01 PM


To

Ben Cope/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

cc

Adrianne Allen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, David Croxton/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Jennings.Jannine@epamail.epa.gov, MaryLou Soscia/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, psyk.christine@epa.gov, Richard Parkin/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Riley.William@epamail. Michael Cox/R10/USEPA/US, Socorro Rodriguez/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject

Re: Dum de dum dum 

Hi Ben,

I don't have definitive answers to your questions, but I will share a few reactions.

On 1, we did not try to smoke out whether or not BuRec is committed to the 'dams in the baseline' position. I will note, however, that a similar argument regarding ESA has been blown out of the water by a federal judge. And the presentation that BuRec made at the meeting was focusing on the options for addressing the temperature problems, how much can be achieved and at what cost. Their description of the temperature problem at Grand Coulee was their interpretation (wrong, I think) of our TMDL. Before going down the TMDL path, we would need to get clear with the Bureau on this issue.

2. What was tentatively agreed to was to hold an initial meeting -- or series of meetings -- to see if our technical and policy people can agree on how to proceed. We assumed that if the technical people were asked to try to come to agreement on a modeling approach (as opposed to figure out ways to block EPA's approach) then at least we could identify areas of agreement and areas of clear disagreement.

3. Turning this work over to the Corps and the Bureau would be foolish, in my view. Remember, we are carrying the environmental ball here on behalf of our state and tribal co-regulators. They are not likely to feel good about the regulated industry drafting the TMDL. This is our work.

4. I am sorry if I gave the impression that the Corps official wants the modelers to be in charge of boundary assumption and other important policy calls. He opined that if you all could get together and share your views, it would serve to identify important policy issues. And I agree that effort needs to include program people.

5. Your point here is a basic one of tactics. I'm not sure I agree with your suggested approach. We send them a couple reports and a

cover letter saying what are your comments, concerns, recommendations. They go off and produce some sort of response, probably using their best technical folks or a hired gun. All we have done is dig deeper into our respective positions.

I am assuming that the Corps and the Bureau are, for whatever reason, legitimately concerned about water quality standards compliance at their dams. They want to resolve their compliance and attainability problems. The states have made it very clear that there will be no progress on that problem without TMDLs. The dam operators' problems can only be addressed on a site-specific basis, and the information to support any site-specific solution starts with a TMDL. We need to complete our TMDL. This feels to me like the basis for a mutual interest.

Enough with the email. If we are going to carry on further, we should have a meeting.

Mike Gearheard
Director, Office of Water and Watersheds
phone: (206) 553-7151
fax: (206) 553-0165
email: gearheard.mike@epa.gov
▼ Ben Cope/R10/USEPA/US

Ben Cope/R10/USEPA/US

11/20/2006 10:50 AM


To

Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

cc

Adrianne Allen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, David Croxton/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Jennings.Jannine@epamail.epa.gov, MaryLou Soscia/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, psyk.christine@epa.gov, Richard Parkin/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Riley.William@epamail. Michael Cox/R10/USEPA/US, Socorro Rodriguez/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject

Re: Dum de dum dum 

All -

A few things come to mind as I ponder the email traffic on this issue:

1) What is the status of the federal policy conflict that stalled us last time?

I recall the problem as the Corps/Bureau taking the position that EPA should develop the TMDL assuming a baseline condition that includes the dam structures (the TMDL would only evaluate temperature impacts of operations, pretty much pointless). Is that issue solved? If not, there is nothing to re-start.

2) Need a strategy.

I appreciate the interest in Columbia temperature and a can-do attitude, but we need a realistic workplan/strategy that gets us from here to a TMDL. I am dubious the Corps/Bureau will agree with any modeling or TMDL we develop. And we need their acceptance, or else, as the Corps' honcho from DC noted, we'll be right back in the same place as before (see #1). So what is our strategy to deal with that? There's a big issue here from a workload and dollars perspective - potentially lots of modeling work and contract expense but no TMDL in the end.

3) Let them do it.

If the Corps/Bureau really want a TMDL, and the modeling is the obstacle, we could offer to let them do the modeling work. They would need to consider our previous work, but they could use a different model and gain our acceptance (though we would be tough reviewers). I don't think they would take us up on the offer, because I don't think the modeling is the real problem. And they've got a budget to consider like we do.

4) Modelers don't decide many of the assumptions.

The Corps' fellow wants the modelers to sit down and agree on assumptions. Some assumptions are truly technical issues, but some big ones are mostly policy issues, e.g., where model boundaries are drawn, whether to simulate temps with no dams, whether daily avg simulations are OK, how to use the model for allocations, etc. Item #1 above could be viewed as a model assumption. So I think you need both modelers and program people involved at the start.

5) Assuming the #1 above is resolved, the Corps/Bureau really support a TMDL that starts with the natural condition, and the model is really the issue...

I think we would need to elicit some info from the Corps in advance of a modelers' meeting. We could write them and ask them to identify their specific concerns with the past modeling and their recommendations for addressing those concerns. We could attach the model files and the two documentation reports written by John Yearsely. One of John's reports is basically the method used for the draft TMDL. We will be able to gauge their interest in a constructive collaboration from their response.

I'm sure we'll be talking more. -BC

▼ Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US

Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US

11/20/2006 08:33 AM


To

MaryLou Soscia/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

cc

Adrianne Allen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Ben Cope/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, David Croxton/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Jennings.Jannine@epamail.epa.gov, psyk.christine@epa.gov, Richard Parkin/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Riley.William@epamail. Michael Cox/R10/USEPA/US, Socorro Rodriguez/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject

Re: Dum de dum dum 

Hearty? That is good news. What I heard before I left on Wednesday was a sort of tepid acknowledgement that TMDL work may need to restart, BUT, only after there is agreement among the various agencies on how to model the Columbia. I agreed that we should try to get on the same page with the technical evaluation protocol and boundary assumptions before moving deeply into the TMDL.

Mike Gearheard
Director, Office of Water and Watersheds
phone: (206) 553-7151
fax: (206) 553-0165
email: gearheard.mike@epa.gov

▼ MaryLou Soscia/R10/USEPA/US

MaryLou Soscia/R10/USEPA/US

11/17/2006 04:41 PM


To

Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Richard Parkin/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Riley.William@epamail. Michael Cox/R10/USEPA/US

cc

Adrianne Allen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Ben Cope/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, David Croxton/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Jennings.Jannine@epamail.epa.gov, psyk.christine@epa.gov, Socorro Rodriguez/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject

Re: Dum de dum dum 

All:

FYI

Here is a scoping paper that Ben, Rick and I put together on starting up the Columbia River TMDL. We envisioned an approximately one year work effort collecting data and running the model before the actual work on the TMDL is begun.

As we start "letting our hair down," I recommend that we begin this work effort as a Columbia River modeling effort and actually begin the TMDL work effort in late 2007 or early 2008. We did hear a hearty endorsement of that pathway from the Corps this week at the last of our many meetings with them.

[attachment "TMDL Work Tasks.doc" deleted by MaryLou Soscia/R10/USEPA/US]

Mary Lou Soscia
Columbia River Coordinator
US EPA - Region 10 - OWW
811 S.W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204
503.326.5873

▼ Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US

Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US

11/16/2006 02:11 PM

To

Richard Parkin/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Riley.William@epamail.epa.gov, Ben Cope/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Adrienne Allen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, soscia.marylou@epa.gov, David Croxton/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

cc

Jennings.Jannine@epamail.epa.gov, psyk.christine@epa.gov

Subject

Dum de dum dum

Good Afternoon, Friends,

At our meeting with the Corps and BuRec (plus Services, States, Tribes) this week in Portland to discuss dams and temperature standard attainment, the matter of the as yet unfinished Columbia River temperature TMDL came up repeatedly. Without getting out ahead of myself, I think it is safe to say that there will be a need for some renewed work on the TMDL. Step one, Ben, might need to be a conversation among the various model pros to see if there are foundational issues to be resolved before more work is put into the TMDL. The Corps seems to be insisting on that preliminary step. Be that as it may, I believe we are looking at new effort to finalize the TMDL over the next ??? time period.

As you can see below. Ron is interested in getting briefed. I will work with ML to set up an hour with Ron sometime between now and the end of December. Heads up. We will want to have one or two more 'let your hair down' sessions before we brief Ron, though, so that we are in agreement as to what we might want to tell him. Be thinking about that, too.

Question number one: who should be on our core team? Please reply.

Mike Gearheard
Director, Office of Water and Watersheds
phone: (206) 553-7151
fax: (206) 553-0165
email: gearheard.mike@epa.gov

----- Forwarded by Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US on 11/16/2006 01:58 PM -----

Ron Kreizenbeck/R10/USEPA/US

11/16/2006 12:17 PM


To

Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

cc

soscia.marylou@epa.gov

Subject

Re: Fw: E-Clips - Thursday, November 16, 2006 

Hey guys, I would like to catch up on the temperature TMDL.

Ron Kreizenbeck
Deputy Regional Administrator
(206) 553-0454

▼ Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US

Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US

11/16/2006 12:04 PM

To

soscia.marylou@epa.gov

cc

Ron Kreizenbeck/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject

Fw: E-Clips - Thursday, November 16, 2006

Note the article on dam breaching. Could be there is hope for your performance rating yet --- sometime in the distant future.

Ron, ML and I carry on this joking reference to dam removal, but it is probably worth a few minutes of your time to bring you up to speed on the Columbia River temperature TMDL (which has nothing to do with breaching). Do you remember that thing? It may have a little

life left in it after all.

Mike Gearheard
Director, Office of Water and Watersheds
phone: (206) 553-7151
fax: (206) 553-0165
email: gearheard.mike@epa.gov

----- Forwarded by Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US on 11/16/2006 11:58 AM -----

Jan Haertel/R10/USEPA/US

11/16/2006 11:16 AM

To:
cc: (bcc: Mike Gearheard/R10/USEPA/US)
Subject: E-Clips - Thursday, November 16, 2006

IdahoStatesman.com

The Idaho Statesman • Always Idaho

11/16/06

Gov.-elect Otter and Federal Officials Challenge the Report's Findings

Report: Breaching dams would save money, salmon

Breaching four Washington Snake River dams to save Idaho's endangered salmon would cost less than leaving the dams in place, according to a report released Wednesday by salmon advocates, taxpayer and business groups. The salmon are an icon of the wild character of the Pacific Northwest. They are integral to the fishing and tourism industry and provide spiritual sustenance to the region's Indian tribes.

<http://www.idahostatesman.com/102/story/60326.html>